

drawings, if they were ever made, have not survived, but the extensive correspondence he had with the Parisian engraver of the volume has, and it attests to the assiduity and care the scholars and craftsmen involved had for its final appearance. The correspondence has been preserved together with Pullan's in the Dilettanti archives at the Society of Antiquaries.

#### 4. THE SANCTUARY OF ATHENA IN THE LIGHT OF RESEARCH SINCE 1869

A great deal has been learned by students of the Sanctuary and its architecture, and many fresh problems raised since Pullan's day. A very recent and extensive treatment, with emphasis on the architecture and a full bibliography, can be found in the monographic study by H. Riemann, 'Pytheos' (*PWRE*, XLVII (1963), cols. 459-513). A briefer article by G. Kleiner, 'Priene' (*PWRE*, Suppl. IX (1962), cols. 1181-1221) covers some of the same ground but puts the Sanctuary in the context of the city. What follows here is intended to summarize some of the major results of this research and to survey briefly the present state of knowledge of the site with special reference to the sculpture. A number of the problems will be dealt with individually and at length in subsequent chapters.

The question of its setting and the development in time of its sculptural embellishment can obviously not be separated from the history of the Sanctuary as a whole. In view of the gaps in external evidence and its frequent ambiguity, the study of the sculpture is not peripheral to the broader historical questions; it is basic evidence.

Since 1869 there has been little or no excavation in the Sanctuary despite the fact that Pullan had only begun a very hasty exploration of the Temenos: nowhere did he reach bedrock. This, were there a chance that excavations could be resumed, might be considered fortunate. Soundings in the area of the Altar, for example, might reveal further important evidence of its component parts, and answer such questions as 'Was there an earlier Altar?' once and for all.

Between 1869 and the next comprehensive study of the Sanctuary thirty years later, the site suffered grievously at the hands of local builders looking for materials for door sills and tombstones. They began immediately after Pullan's departure. This was chronicled by Mr. A. O. Clarke, whose discovery in 1870 of silver tetradrachms bearing the portrait of Orophernes at the base of the cult statue gave the pillagers an added incentive. A few years later Rayet and Thomas confirmed Clarke's account and published their observations in *Milet et la golfe latmique* (Paris, 1880). They, thanks to Newton, were acquainted with Pullan's results, but added little to the understanding of the site and its problems. Their text and plates drew attention to the rich polychromy of the Temple, the extensive remains of which Pullan had carefully described in his notebooks (for example, v, 38, 43) but not in his published text. Their plan of the Temple, on the other hand, is seriously inaccurate: it omits, for example, the stairs between the pronaos and cella. One plate, as noted above (p. 19), mysteriously includes a fragment of the Erechtheion frieze.<sup>19</sup>

While Wiegand and Schrader (1895-8) uncovered much of the rest of the city of Priene for the first time, they did little but clean Pullan's excavation and remeasure what was left of the Sanctuary after the vandalism of the intervening years. A comparison of Pullan's photographs and plans with Schrader's makes it instantly obvious how extensive this was.

Pullan found the cella walls standing 1.5 m. high on the north side. In Pullan's photographs the door frames of the cella and opisthodomos, the bases of the antae on both ends and the plinths of the columns of the east façade are *in situ*. The columns of the opisthodomos, intact to a height of 3 or 4 m., as Pullan proudly noted, made the Temple one of the better-preserved monuments of Ionic architecture in Asia Minor. All this had disappeared, along with the pavement and steps of the cella and pronaos and, of course, everything on them. The Altar fared little better. The steps and podia blocks, *in situ* for Pullan's camera, had been scattered when Schrader arrived. Only the Propylon was in more or less the same condition. The lowest course of its wall on the south side, though, was completely preserved in 1869, with anta and column bases and plinths of the tetrastyle façade in the west in place. These, as well as significant traces of the interior, were no longer in evidence in 1895.

The activities of the German excavators added sculpture and architectural elements to the museums of Turkey and Germany. To Istanbul went nine fragments of the relief sculptures from the Temple (10, 25, 28, 34, 35, 42, 43, 66, 67) which were said to have been found in the English dump and near the Theatre. Berlin acquired the standing female from the Altar, 69, which Pullan had discovered and photographed (see above, pp. 16 f., and Chapter III), and a sample of the architecture of the Temple and Altar. Wiegand and Schrader's *Priene* (Berlin, 1904) set a contemporary standard of scholarly precision and was, in certain ways, ahead of its time. It was a multi-disciplinary effort, with sections on geography and geology written by experts. The site was considered in the context of ancient settlement in the region, including rural settlement. All of this was conveniently under one cover: separate excellent volumes subsequently dealt with the inscriptions and coins. As a result Priene is one of the better documented Hellenistic sites in Asia Minor. Some of Schrader's contributions to the study of the Sanctuary will be clear in the discussions of its components which follow. Although surely more complete and more carefully researched than Pullan's published account, Schrader's could never have remained the authoritative word on the subject. Special studies have filled in some gaps, but the first publication of the architecture to conform to modern standards of accuracy and detail is still in preparation. Schrader simply modified Pullan's plans of the Temple and Temenos: that of the Temenos as a whole goes back in turn to one made in 1845 by Edward Falkener.

Some features of the Sanctuary have never been incorporated into a general site plan. The lack of proper documentation, not only of the sculpture but also of the architecture of what has been rightly claimed to be one of the most influential Ionic buildings, has long been lamented. Now, happily, the German Archaeological Institute in Istanbul has begun the monumental task of recording and studying all the buildings of the Sanctuary. Soon, hopefully, the present volume on the sculpture, which has benefited much from the Institute's generously shared results, will have a long-awaited and impressive complement.

#### Temple

##### Architect and dedicator

Two pieces of documentary evidence are fundamental to an understanding of the Temple's place in history — not simply of its niche in architectural history, but also of its relation to major events in the political and economic history of south-west Asia Minor before and after Alexander's conquest:

1. Vitruvius records the vital fact of the identity of the architect. He cites the *Commentaries* of Pytheos, '... *Pythius, qui Prieni aedem Minervae nobiliter est architectatus...*', 'the celebrated builder of the Temple of Minerva at Priene' (Book I, 1, 12), and in a list of books on temples by their builders he placed Pytheos' on the 'Ionic fane of Minerva at Priene' between those on the Parthenon by Ictinus and Carpion and the work of Chersiphron and Metagenes 'on the Ionic Temple at Ephesus, which is Diana's'. The same list includes a work on the Mausoleum by Satyros and Pytheos, 'who were favoured with the greatest and highest good fortune', '... *edidit volumen... de fano Minervae, quod est Prienae ionicum, Pytheos... de Mausoleo Satyros et Pytheos. Quibus vero felicitas maximum summumque contulit munus*' (Book VII, Preface 12). Vitruvius was at least familiar with the contents of Pytheos' works, so that his, or his source's, attribution of the Temple to Pytheos and Pytheos' connection with the Mausoleum should only be doubted if there is strong evidence to the contrary.<sup>20</sup> Two other sources, Pliny (*NH*, xxxvi, 31) and an Alexandrian papyrus, also connect Pytheos to the Mausoleum, as Waywell has emphasized.<sup>21</sup>

Despite obvious differences and the generally 'unacademic' character of the Mausoleum in contrast to that of the Temple, they have significant points in common. The distinctive capitals with palmettes on the echinus, for example, are practically indistinguishable.<sup>22</sup> The carving of decorative details is very similar, and on the two buildings can be seen the two earliest examples of coffers which cover an entire intercolumniation with sculptured scenes on their lids, a fact that is fundamental to this study (see below and Chapter II). The precise nature of Pytheos' contribution to the Mausoleum project will probably long remain a subject of debate, but it is likely to have been an important one.<sup>23</sup>

2. Βασιλεὺς Ἀλέξανδρος ἀνέθηκε τὸν ναὸν Ἀθηναίῃ Πολιάδι, 'King Alexander dedicated the temple to Athena Polias' (*Inchriften von Priene — IvPr*, no. 156), reads the inscription in fine letters of the fourth century B.C., once located high up on an anta at the eastern end of the Temple. It established the dedicator's identity without ambiguity. The inscription has traditionally been dated to the period immediately after the battle of Granicus in 334 B.C. on the basis of historical probability. There is no firm proof, but this was the period of Alexander's conquest of this region and his liberation of the Greek cities of Asia Minor, and he, perhaps, had more reason to think about Priene at this point than at any other time.<sup>24</sup>

Later dates have, however, been put forward. Badian believed the inscription to be slightly later, part of a second settlement of the city by Alexander. His principal objection to the date 334 B.C. is that Alexander would not have used the title 'King' at this stage. He also finds it too unbelievably 'lucky' that Alexander should find a temple ready to be dedicated immediately after his rebuff by the citizens of Ephesus.<sup>25</sup> Van Berchem and more recently Hornblower have argued that the city was refounded by Alexander (see below, pp. 28 f.), which would imply that the Temple was actually dedicated near the end of Alexander's life.<sup>26</sup>

The story recounted by Strabo (xiv, 1, 22) of Alexander's offer to finish the Temple of Artemis at his own expense in return for the honour of inscribing his name on it as dedicator, and of the Ephesians' proud refusal, has often been cited by historians and archaeologists in connection with his dedication of the Athena Temple. The implication has been that had he been successful at Ephesus he probably would never have bothered with Priene. This view overlooks some important connections which will be treated below.

Construction both at Ephesus and, in the traditional view, at Priene (see below) would have been under way when Alexander arrived in the area after Granicus. The Archaic Artemision had burned, according to legend, on the night of Alexander's birth (356 B.C.) and reconstruction, as Bammer has recently maintained, probably began shortly afterwards. There are some indications that Pytheos may also have been involved in the early stages of this project.<sup>27</sup> The work on the Athena Temple would have reached at least the level of the anta capitals at the eastern end of the Temple, having been begun some time in the previous decade. It may be possible to be more precise about the initial stages and progress of the work: there is no concrete evidence, but the circumstantial evidence is highly suggestive.

Pytheos' earlier association with the great Hecatomnid monument, the Mausoleum, suggests the possibility that the Carian dynasty was involved with the work at Priene. If so, the most likely candidates to be benefactors would have been Idrieus and Ada. It would appear that Pytheos' collaborator on the Mausoleum, Satyros, continued to work for the family, when he (in all probability) executed bronze statues of these successors and siblings of Maussollos and Artemisia at Delphi.<sup>28</sup> The work would have been carried out between 351 and 344 B.C., after the death of Artemisia and before the death of Idrieus, while both ruled together.

It is in this period also that Pytheos should have begun work on the Temple at Priene, according to the high chronology adopted by von Gaertringen, J. M. Cook and others.<sup>29</sup> In this view, the refounding of Priene belongs to the period of the domination of this area of the Ionian coast and islands by the Carian dynasty. Halicarnassus became the capital of Maussollos's empire in 367 B.C. and the city was replanned with the Mausoleum as the architectural centrepiece.<sup>30</sup> Maussollos' aggressive foreign policy, which supported the oligarchs in cities, caused a number of them, including Rhodes and Cos, to fall away from the second Athenian confederacy and come under his control.<sup>31</sup> Priene's importance in his eyes would have derived from her role as traditional leader and sometime host of the Ionian League. There is no explicit statement that Maussollos wished to increase his influence within the League, but it would have served his purpose and there is evidence that he patronized individual Ionian cities. One member of the League, Erythrai, having made an alliance with him, is recorded to have erected a bronze statue of Maussollos in the agora, and a marble one of Artemisia — a precedent to be borne in mind — in the Temple of Athena.<sup>32</sup> (It is interesting to note that Erythrai later gave Philip his first foothold on the Ionian coast, through the good offices of the tyrant Hermias, brother-in-law of Aristotle, who soon afterwards, as is well known, became Alexander's tutor.)

The independent policy of Maussollos, which kept Persia distant and opposed Athens, was followed by his successors. An inscription set up in Delphi may indicate that Miletus, Priene's most powerful near neighbour, was in the Carian sphere in the 340s.<sup>33</sup> The dynasty controlled much of south-west Asia Minor and some of the islands at this time. The evidence seems to show that Idrieus was a loyal satrap, who enjoyed considerable autonomy while increasing his own, and incidentally Persian, influence at the expense of Athens. Idrieus' predominant position in the region is evident also in his patronage of the Sanctuary of Zeus at Labranda, as revealed in the recently discovered inscriptions.<sup>34</sup>

The mid-century years would have been a likely period for a Carian intervention in

Prienean affairs. The Mausoleum, according to Waywell, was probably completed by 351 B.C. or shortly afterwards and Pytheos would have been free to plan, as Kleiner has suggested, the entire new Priene and begin construction of its central monument, the Temple of Athena.<sup>35</sup> If this is so, the refounding of Priene may have been the realization of an earlier ambitious scheme of Maussollos himself to create a fortified centre of the Ionian League under Carian patronage.

About the time of the refounding of the city on its present site, a new seat was built for the Ionian League at Panionion. Kleiner, in line with the high date, assumed that Panionion also belonged to the mid-fourth century B.C.<sup>36</sup> The recent investigation of the site has shown that the Bouleuterion of Panionion employed the same unit of measurement (0.295 m.) which Pytheos introduced at Priene. It is the basic unit not only of the Temple but of the city plan as well, and according to Waywell, it is very nearly equal to that employed in the Mausoleum (but not at Ephesus).<sup>37</sup> There is, however, no independent evidence that Panionion need be this early.

A case has been made, though not perhaps as strongly, for Athenian participation in the refounding. The Athenian influence has been seen in many aspects of the life of the new city, and it has been thought that this may reflect the renewed interest of Athens in the Ionian cities around the middle of the fourth century B.C. The tribal organization and calendar, however, may go back to an earlier period when Athens was considered the refounder of many Ionian cities. The earliest coins of the refounded Priene display the head of Athena (first in a Corinthian then an Attic helmet), but also honour Poseidon Helikonios, the patron god of the Ionian League. The Athena head also appeared on coins of the old city.<sup>38</sup> Very early on, Priene sent a delegation to the Great Panathenaia. Inscriptions record the event (*IvPr*, no. 5) and honoured an Athenian with citizenship (*IvPr*, no. 6).

The most visible reminder of Athens was, of course, the Temple, dedicated to Athena Polias. Some relations between the building and the Parthenon have been noted. New evidence presented in Chapter IV, that the cella was planned with a view to its eventually containing a version of the Parthenos — which, with some delay, it did — suggests a close attention to specifically Athenian precedents.

Athens had both a motive and an opportunity to court a former ally (Priene's name appeared regularly in the tribute lists of the fifth century). After 351 B.C., with Maussollos and now Artemisia out of the way, Athens may perhaps have felt freer to assert her influence over the Ionians, at the expense of Idrieus and the Persians. On the whole, however, her policy towards the Carian dynasty, as demonstrated by her refusal to aid the revolt of the democrats in Rhodes, was cautious.

From either the Carian or Athenian point of view, the period 351–344 B.C. seems the most suitable and advantageous for the refounding of Priene and the beginning of the Temple, but an alternative date has recently been proposed.

There is very little documentary evidence to prove that Priene was actually in existence in the 340s. None of the surviving inscriptions can be absolutely proved to refer to events before those mentioned in Alexander's decree for Naulochos (*IvPr*, no. 1), which has simply been assumed to refer to the period immediately after Granicus. Van Berchem's theory that Alexander refounded Priene and that for some time before this Priene had been replaced by Naulochos as a political and social entity rests heavily on the observation that in a recently

discovered Argive list of *thearodokoi* dating from the 330s the name of Priene was omitted, that of Naulochos appearing instead. It is inconvenient that no ancient source mentions this important act of Alexander.

The treatment of Pytheos is curious. Van Berchem offers an interpretation of what Pytheos' book about the Temple really was, as opposed to what the text of Vitruvius says it was, and concludes that the Prienians had only the 'illusion' of possessing a Temple by Pytheos. Hornblower likewise plays down the importance of Pytheos, an 'obscure figure'. It is perhaps untrue, as Riemann maintained, that only twice as much was known about Herodotus, but Pytheos' surviving works have not been as carefully studied by historians. Hornblower's arguments for Alexander are much more extensive and include references to archaeological evidence other than the Temple: in support of the later date for the city he cites recent studies of the city wall.<sup>39</sup>

The arguments for the high chronology and those for a refounding by Alexander, which cannot easily be summarized here, are reviewed by Hornblower, who concludes that the weight of evidence favours the latter, though only 'marginally'. The evidence from the Temple should serve to narrow the gap.

The participation of the Hecatomnids was originally suggested by the documented presence of Pytheos: it is supported by another piece of evidence which also relates closely to Alexander. This is not a written document, but is in its way as eloquent as an inscription. The large female head found by Pullan in the cella, 85, is stylistically indistinguishable from the dynastic portraits of the Mausoleum and, as will be argued fully in Chapter V, it was very probably carved by a sculptor who worked there. The marble, probably Parian, is different from any used at Priene (see Appendix 2), though used for free-standing sculpture on the Mausoleum. If it were made expressly for the Temple and not moved there later, this would point strongly to the hand of Pytheos or a member of his crew, and a date shortly after his work on the Mausoleum.

Who is represented and what was her connection with the Temple? The answer proposed here involves a reconsideration of Alexander's policy towards the Greek cities within the area of Carian influence and the surrounding countryside, or *chora*, much of which remained the King's land.

It was a non-Greek act to dedicate a temple, in the first place, and in doing so Alexander was following a precedent established by Asiatic rulers (see Chapter IV). Among the earliest and most conspicuous examples of a ruler placing his name in a prominent place on a temple in the area of Asia Minor showing Greek influence were the dedications of Maussollos and Idrieus in the sanctuary of Zeus at Labranda.<sup>40</sup> Alexander must certainly have been aware of this — but in any event his wording follows the pattern of the Carian dynasties with one important change: he used his title, 'King'.

It was in keeping with Alexander's past behaviour that he should choose to associate himself again with Athena. He had sacrificed to her on first landing in Asia and again on the site of Troy. His devotions there as well as his abortive attempt to dedicate the Artemision at Ephesus suggest that his associating himself with the principal cults in the Greek cities of Asia Minor was not solely a reflection of his religiosity but also part of a policy of winning acceptance for himself and his rule. Is it pure coincidence that he should have wished his name on the Temple which replaced one bearing the inscription βασιλεύς Κροίσος ἀνέθηκε,

'King Kroisos dedicated (this temple)' (on a moulding of a sculptural column drum), and that he used exactly the same formula to dedicate the Temple to Athena?<sup>41</sup>

Alexander, as Philip before him, cannot have been ignorant of the connection of Kroisos (Croesus) with the Temple of Artemis, which was recounted also by Herodotus (Book I, 92). For a commander contemplating conquest, the example of Croesus would seem an inappropriate one to emulate, but for Alexander's plans after Granicus, Croesus would have been an admirable model. He had, before his fatal defeat, conquered the Greek cities on the Ionian coast, but had remained friendly to them and patronized their cults. He was considered a paradigm of piety (and according to a version of his legend known at least by Bacchylides' time, he was saved from the pyre by Apollo and immortalized).<sup>42</sup>

By employing his Macedonian royal title, Alexander may perhaps have offended the Prienians to whom he had promised the autonomy of which their subsequent inscriptions proudly boast. In the context of Caria, however, it was particularly appropriate. Maussollos and Artemisia may not have called themselves King and Queen — though later writers often do — but they theoretically administered Caria for the great King. Alexander, in 334 B.C., had pressing needs. Might not the reference to his position as King have been part of a practical solution to the problem of revenue, or of a plan to justify a claim on the land outside the city walls? This belonged to 'the King' and was regularly let out to big landholders who worked it with serfs, the luckless *pedieis*.

In Alexander's decree for Naulochos, noted above, the autonomy of the citizens of Priene is underlined, as is the obligation for non-citizens living in the countryside to pay tribute. A garrison is mentioned, which would have ensured compliance. Possession of the *syntaxis* of the *chora* would have brought Alexander the income he very much required in the early stage of his conquest.

Priene — if indeed he ever visited it — would have been a brief pause in Alexander's advance towards Halicarnassus, which he successfully besieged in the following year (333 B.C.). The year of Granicus had marked the death of Pixodaros, who in 340 had usurped the satrapy from his sister, Ada, the widow of Idrieus. He had attempted to ally Caria to Macedonia through the marriage of his daughter Ada (the younger) to Philip's son Arrhidaios, much to the displeasure of Olympias and Alexander, but returned to the Persian fold. His eventual son-in-law Orontopates lost Halicarnassus, but Ada, who had survived the *coup* of 340, continued to represent the legitimate claim of the Carian rule. Her relationship with Alexander is recounted with touching detail by Arrian (I, 23, 1-6; II, 5, 7): she soon adopted him as her son and he, with filial devotion, restored her to her former position. She apparently died in about 331 B.C. (possibly later), and in this way Alexander became the ruler of Caria.

Both Alexander's choice of the Temple of Athena at Priene and his use of the title 'King' take on added significance if one is permitted to see in the idealized features of the great head in the cella those of Ada, his adoptive mother, patron of the city and its temple and the King's satrap.

In this conjectural reconstruction of the events surrounding the foundation of the Athena Temple and its dedication, a date shortly after 351 B.C. appears most probable for Pytheos' original plan and the beginnings of construction. Waywell has argued that the major work on the Mausoleum was finished at Artemisia's death.<sup>43</sup> If Pytheos did contribute to the project at Ephesus between his work at the Mausoleum and Priene, then perhaps work

began nearer the mid-340s. If it was funded at least in part by Idrieus and Ada, the death of Idrieus in 344 B.C. and the loss of the throne by Ada in 340 may very well have caused a cessation of the work, and given Alexander the opportunity for a good deed which would serve his ends in a very obvious way (while costing him little, it would seem. See p. 37 below). In this sense Alexander was 'lucky' to find this particular temple incomplete, and in need of a benefactor.

Pytheos' authorship is not, however, excluded by the later date for the new Priene. His career could well have extended from the 360s to the 320s. He might have begun work on it for Alexander in the 330s, though one wonders what he and his crew would have been doing for nearly two decades between the virtual completion of the Mausoleum in 351 B.C. and Alexander's commission. There was Ephesus, of course, and it has been suggested that Pytheos was involved in the work at Labranda, though as Hornblower points out, this is not likely. The work would, in this view, have also been begun while Ada was ruling (after her restoration) and her portrait might have been executed at Priene in the late 330s (although this is less likely, see above, p. 30, and Chapter V), or moved from the Mausoleum (also unlikely) at any time before her death. Alexander's dedication, all the same, may have been carved on the anta when the work had reached that point, rather than when it was finally complete. An important implication in the problem of the separate phases of the Temple (see p. 33 ff., below) is that the gap between the initiation and completion of the work would have to be reduced from a quarter century to a decade, if the latter date is accepted.

#### *Pytheos' plan*

The Temple of Athena was perhaps the single most influential building of the so-called 'Ionian renaissance' of the second half of the fourth century B.C. This must certainly have been due in part to Pytheos' book on the subject in which he elaborated his new canon of the Ionic order. For its principal characteristics the remains of the Temple are the most reliable witness (Vitruvius, who, as noted above, was surely familiar with Pytheos' writings, apparently did not rely extensively on them in describing his ideal Ionic temple, but seems rather to have preferred Hermogenes' work).

The plan is compact, six columns across the façade, eleven along the flanks, which form five and ten intercolumnar bays respectively — a ratio of 1:2. This results in a ratio of nearly 1:2 between the width and length of the Temple. The columns rest on a three-stepped base, characteristic of the Doric rather than of Ionic temples in Asia Minor. (The Doric, it should be noted, was generally criticized by Pytheos for its awkwardness.)

The measurements of the individual parts, as Schrader and Dörpfeld have shown, can be expressed as multiples of an Ionic foot of 0.295 m. (0.294 m. according to Dinsmoor), and are related in integral ratios. This is one of the most striking and characteristic features of Pytheos' design. The interior length of the cella, for example, is 50 ft., the pronaos 30 ft., the opisthodomos 12 ft., and the walls between, combined, measure 8 ft. The sum, the total length of the naos, not counting the projections of the antae at each end, is 100 ft. A column 43 ft. high results from assuming a ratio of 1:10 between lower diameter and height, as Penrose and Krischen did (but not Schrader, who argued for a ratio of 1:8½). The more slender column is in the Archaic tradition, which Pytheos made use of elsewhere in the building. According to Riemann, when the 7-ft. height on the entablature is added to that

drawings, if they were ever made, have not survived, but the extensive correspondence he had with the Parisian engraver of the volume has, and it attests to the assiduity and care the scholars and craftsmen involved had for its final appearance. The correspondence has been preserved together with Pullan's in the Dilettanti archives at the Society of Antiquaries.

#### 4. THE SANCTUARY OF ATHENA IN THE LIGHT OF RESEARCH SINCE 1869

A great deal has been learned by students of the Sanctuary and its architecture, and many fresh problems raised since Pullan's day. A very recent and extensive treatment, with emphasis on the architecture and a full bibliography, can be found in the monographic study by H. Riemann, 'Pytheos' (*PWRE*, XLVII (1963), cols. 459-513). A briefer article by G. Kleiner, 'Priene' (*PWRE*, Suppl. IX (1962), cols. 1181-1221) covers some of the same ground but puts the Sanctuary in the context of the city. What follows here is intended to summarize some of the major results of this research and to survey briefly the present state of knowledge of the site with special reference to the sculpture. A number of the problems will be dealt with individually and at length in subsequent chapters.

The question of its setting and the development in time of its sculptural embellishment can obviously not be separated from the history of the Sanctuary as a whole. In view of the gaps in external evidence and its frequent ambiguity, the study of the sculpture is not peripheral to the broader historical questions; it is basic evidence.

Since 1869 there has been little or no excavation in the Sanctuary despite the fact that Pullan had only begun a very hasty exploration of the Temenos: nowhere did he reach bedrock. This, were there a chance that excavations could be resumed, might be considered fortunate. Soundings in the area of the Altar, for example, might reveal further important evidence of its component parts, and answer such questions as 'Was there an earlier Altar?' once and for all.

Between 1869 and the next comprehensive study of the Sanctuary thirty years later, the site suffered grievously at the hands of local builders looking for materials for door sills and tombstones. They began immediately after Pullan's departure. This was chronicled by Mr. A. O. Clarke, whose discovery in 1870 of silver tetradrachms bearing the portrait of Orophernes at the base of the cult statue gave the pillagers an added incentive. A few years later Rayet and Thomas confirmed Clarke's account and published their observations in *Milet et la golfe latmique* (Paris, 1880). They, thanks to Newton, were acquainted with Pullan's results, but added little to the understanding of the site and its problems. Their text and plates drew attention to the rich polychromy of the Temple, the extensive remains of which Pullan had carefully described in his notebooks (for example, v, 38, 43) but not in his published text. Their plan of the Temple, on the other hand, is seriously inaccurate: it omits, for example, the stairs between the pronaos and cella. One plate, as noted above (p. 19), mysteriously includes a fragment of the Erechtheion frieze.<sup>19</sup>

While Wiegand and Schrader (1895-8) uncovered much of the rest of the city of Priene for the first time, they did little but clean Pullan's excavation and remeasure what was left of the Sanctuary after the vandalism of the intervening years. A comparison of Pullan's photographs and plans with Schrader's makes it instantly obvious how extensive this was.

Pullan found the cella walls standing 1.5 m. high on the north side. In Pullan's photographs the door frames of the cella and opisthodomos, the bases of the antae on both ends and the plinths of the columns of the east façade are *in situ*. The columns of the opisthodomos, intact to a height of 3 or 4 m., as Pullan proudly noted, made the Temple one of the better-preserved monuments of Ionic architecture in Asia Minor. All this had disappeared, along with the pavement and steps of the cella and pronaos and, of course, everything on them. The Altar fared little better. The steps and podia blocks, *in situ* for Pullan's camera, had been scattered when Schrader arrived. Only the Propylon was in more or less the same condition. The lowest course of its wall on the south side, though, was completely preserved in 1869, with anta and column bases and plinths of the tetrastyle façade in the west in place. These, as well as significant traces of the interior, were no longer in evidence in 1895.

The activities of the German excavators added sculpture and architectural elements to the museums of Turkey and Germany. To Istanbul went nine fragments of the relief sculptures from the Temple (10, 25, 28, 34, 35, 42, 43, 66, 67) which were said to have been found in the English dump and near the Theatre. Berlin acquired the standing female from the Altar, 69, which Pullan had discovered and photographed (see above, pp. 16 f., and Chapter III), and a sample of the architecture of the Temple and Altar. Wiegand and Schrader's *Priene* (Berlin, 1904) set a contemporary standard of scholarly precision and was, in certain ways, ahead of its time. It was a multi-disciplinary effort, with sections on geography and geology written by experts. The site was considered in the context of ancient settlement in the region, including rural settlement. All of this was conveniently under one cover: separate excellent volumes subsequently dealt with the inscriptions and coins. As a result Priene is one of the better documented Hellenistic sites in Asia Minor. Some of Schrader's contributions to the study of the Sanctuary will be clear in the discussions of its components which follow. Although surely more complete and more carefully researched than Pullan's published account, Schrader's could never have remained the authoritative word on the subject. Special studies have filled in some gaps, but the first publication of the architecture to conform to modern standards of accuracy and detail is still in preparation. Schrader simply modified Pullan's plans of the Temple and Temenos: that of the Temenos as a whole goes back in turn to one made in 1845 by Edward Falkener.

Some features of the Sanctuary have never been incorporated into a general site plan. The lack of proper documentation, not only of the sculpture but also of the architecture of what has been rightly claimed to be one of the most influential Ionic buildings, has long been lamented. Now, happily, the German Archaeological Institute in Istanbul has begun the monumental task of recording and studying all the buildings of the Sanctuary. Soon, hopefully, the present volume on the sculpture, which has benefited much from the Institute's generously shared results, will have a long-awaited and impressive complement.

#### *Temple*

##### *Architect and dedicator*

Two pieces of documentary evidence are fundamental to an understanding of the Temple's place in history — not simply of its niche in architectural history, but also of its relation to major events in the political and economic history of south-west Asia Minor before and after Alexander's conquest:

1. Vitruvius records the vital fact of the identity of the architect. He cites the *Commentaries* of Pytheos, '... *Pythius, qui Prieni aedem Minervae nobiliter est architectatus...*', 'the celebrated builder of the Temple of Minerva at Priene' (Book I, 1, 12), and in a list of books on temples by their builders he placed Pytheos' on the 'Ionic fane of Minerva at Priene' between those on the Parthenon by Ictinus and Carpion and the work of Chersiphron and Metagenes 'on the Ionic Temple at Ephesus, which is Diana's'. The same list includes a work on the Mausoleum by Satyros and Pytheos, 'who were favoured with the greatest and highest good fortune', '... *edidit volumen... de fano Minervae, quod est Prienae ionicum, Pytheos... de Mausoleo Satyros et Pytheos. Quibus vero felicitas maximum summumque contulit munus*' (Book VII, Preface 12). Vitruvius was at least familiar with the contents of Pytheos' works, so that his, or his source's, attribution of the Temple to Pytheos and Pytheos' connection with the Mausoleum should only be doubted if there is strong evidence to the contrary.<sup>20</sup> Two other sources, Pliny (*NH*, xxxvi, 31) and an Alexandrian papyrus, also connect Pytheos to the Mausoleum, as Waywell has emphasized.<sup>21</sup>

Despite obvious differences and the generally 'unacademic' character of the Mausoleum in contrast to that of the Temple, they have significant points in common. The distinctive capitals with palmettes on the echinus, for example, are practically indistinguishable.<sup>22</sup> The carving of decorative details is very similar, and on the two buildings can be seen the two earliest examples of coffers which cover an entire intercolumniation with sculptured scenes on their lids, a fact that is fundamental to this study (see below and Chapter II). The precise nature of Pytheos' contribution to the Mausoleum project will probably long remain a subject of debate, but it is likely to have been an important one.<sup>23</sup>

2. Βασιλεὺς Ἀλέξανδρος ἀνέθηκε τὸν ναὸν Ἀθηναίῃ Πολιάδι, 'King Alexander dedicated the temple to Athena Polias' (*Inscripfen von Priene — IvPr*, no. 156), reads the inscription in fine letters of the fourth century B.C., once located high up on an anta at the eastern end of the Temple. It established the dedicator's identity without ambiguity. The inscription has traditionally been dated to the period immediately after the battle of Granicus in 334 B.C. on the basis of historical probability. There is no firm proof, but this was the period of Alexander's conquest of this region and his liberation of the Greek cities of Asia Minor, and he, perhaps, had more reason to think about Priene at this point than at any other time.<sup>24</sup>

Later dates have, however, been put forward. Badian believed the inscription to be slightly later, part of a second settlement of the city by Alexander. His principal objection to the date 334 B.C. is that Alexander would not have used the title 'King' at this stage. He also finds it too unbelievably 'lucky' that Alexander should find a temple ready to be dedicated immediately after his rebuff by the citizens of Ephesus.<sup>25</sup> Van Berchem and more recently Hornblower have argued that the city was refounded by Alexander (see below, pp. 28 f.), which would imply that the Temple was actually dedicated near the end of Alexander's life.<sup>26</sup>

The story recounted by Strabo (xiv, 1, 22) of Alexander's offer to finish the Temple of Artemis at his own expense in return for the honour of inscribing his name on it as dedicator, and of the Ephesians' proud refusal, has often been cited by historians and archaeologists in connection with his dedication of the Athena Temple. The implication has been that had he been successful at Ephesus he probably would never have bothered with Priene. This view overlooks some important connections which will be treated below.

Construction both at Ephesus and, in the traditional view, at Priene (see below) would have been under way when Alexander arrived in the area after Granicus. The Archaic Artemision had burned, according to legend, on the night of Alexander's birth (356 B.C.) and reconstruction, as Bammer has recently maintained, probably began shortly afterwards. There are some indications that Pytheos may also have been involved in the early stages of this project.<sup>27</sup> The work on the Athena Temple would have reached at least the level of the anta capitals at the eastern end of the Temple, having been begun some time in the previous decade. It may be possible to be more precise about the initial stages and progress of the work: there is no concrete evidence, but the circumstantial evidence is highly suggestive.

Pytheos' earlier association with the great Hecatomnid monument, the Mausoleum, suggests the possibility that the Carian dynasty was involved with the work at Priene. If so, the most likely candidates to be benefactors would have been Idrieus and Ada. It would appear that Pytheos' collaborator on the Mausoleum, Satyros, continued to work for the family, when he (in all probability) executed bronze statues of these successors and siblings of Maussollos and Artemisia at Delphi.<sup>28</sup> The work would have been carried out between 351 and 344 B.C., after the death of Artemisia and before the death of Idrieus, while both ruled together.

It is in this period also that Pytheos should have begun work on the Temple at Priene, according to the high chronology adopted by von Gaertringen, J. M. Cook and others.<sup>29</sup> In this view, the refounding of Priene belongs to the period of the domination of this area of the Ionian coast and islands by the Carian dynasty. Halicarnassus became the capital of Maussollos's empire in 367 B.C. and the city was replanned with the Mausoleum as the architectural centrepiece.<sup>30</sup> Maussollos' aggressive foreign policy, which supported the oligarchs in cities, caused a number of them, including Rhodes and Cos, to fall away from the second Athenian confederacy and come under his control.<sup>31</sup> Priene's importance in his eyes would have derived from her role as traditional leader and sometime host of the Ionian League. There is no explicit statement that Maussollos wished to increase his influence within the League, but it would have served his purpose and there is evidence that he patronized individual Ionian cities. One member of the League, Erythrai, having made an alliance with him, is recorded to have erected a bronze statue of Maussollos in the agora, and a marble one of Artemisia — a precedent to be borne in mind — in the Temple of Athena.<sup>32</sup> (It is interesting to note that Erythrai later gave Philip his first foothold on the Ionian coast, through the good offices of the tyrant Hermias, brother-in-law of Aristotle, who soon afterwards, as is well known, became Alexander's tutor.)

The independent policy of Maussollos, which kept Persia distant and opposed Athens, was followed by his successors. An inscription set up in Delphi may indicate that Miletus, Priene's most powerful near neighbour, was in the Carian sphere in the 340s.<sup>33</sup> The dynasty controlled much of south-west Asia Minor and some of the islands at this time. The evidence seems to show that Idrieus was a loyal satrap, who enjoyed considerable autonomy while increasing his own, and incidentally Persian, influence at the expense of Athens. Idrieus' predominant position in the region is evident also in his patronage of the Sanctuary of Zeus at Labranda, as revealed in the recently discovered inscriptions.<sup>34</sup>

The mid-century years would have been a likely period for a Carian intervention in

Prienian affairs. The Mausoleum, according to Waywell, was probably completed by 351 B.C. or shortly afterwards and Pytheos would have been free to plan, as Kleiner has suggested, the entire new Priene and begin construction of its central monument, the Temple of Athena.<sup>35</sup> If this is so, the refounding of Priene may have been the realization of an earlier ambitious scheme of Maussollos himself to create a fortified centre of the Ionian League under Carian patronage.

About the time of the refounding of the city on its present site, a new seat was built for the Ionian League at Panionion. Kleiner, in line with the high date, assumed that Panionion also belonged to the mid-fourth century B.C.<sup>36</sup> The recent investigation of the site has shown that the Bouleuterion of Panionion employed the same unit of measurement (0.295 m.) which Pytheos introduced at Priene. It is the basic unit not only of the Temple but of the city plan as well, and according to Waywell, it is very nearly equal to that employed in the Mausoleum (but not at Ephesus).<sup>37</sup> There is, however, no independent evidence that Panionion need be this early.

A case has been made, though not perhaps as strongly, for Athenian participation in the refounding. The Athenian influence has been seen in many aspects of the life of the new city, and it has been thought that this may reflect the renewed interest of Athens in the Ionian cities around the middle of the fourth century B.C. The tribal organization and calendar, however, may go back to an earlier period when Athens was considered the refounder of many Ionian cities. The earliest coins of the refounded Priene display the head of Athena (first in a Corinthian then an Attic helmet), but also honour Poseidon Helikonios, the patron god of the Ionian League. The Athena head also appeared on coins of the old city.<sup>38</sup> Very early on, Priene sent a delegation to the Great Panathenaia. Inscriptions record the event (*IvPr*, no. 5) and honoured an Athenian with citizenship (*IvPr*, no. 6).

The most visible reminder of Athens was, of course, the Temple, dedicated to Athena Polias. Some relations between the building and the Parthenon have been noted. New evidence presented in Chapter IV, that the cella was planned with a view to its eventually containing a version of the Parthenos — which, with some delay, it did — suggests a close attention to specifically Athenian precedents.

Athens had both a motive and an opportunity to court a former ally (Priene's name appeared regularly in the tribute lists of the fifth century). After 351 B.C., with Maussollos and now Artemisia out of the way, Athens may perhaps have felt freer to assert her influence over the Ionians, at the expense of Idrieus and the Persians. On the whole, however, her policy towards the Carian dynasty, as demonstrated by her refusal to aid the revolt of the democrats in Rhodes, was cautious.

From either the Carian or Athenian point of view, the period 351–344 B.C. seems the most suitable and advantageous for the refounding of Priene and the beginning of the Temple, but an alternative date has recently been proposed.

There is very little documentary evidence to prove that Priene was actually in existence in the 340s. None of the surviving inscriptions can be absolutely proved to refer to events before those mentioned in Alexander's decree for Naulochos (*IvPr*, no. 1), which has simply been assumed to refer to the period immediately after Granicus. Van Berchem's theory that Alexander refounded Priene and that for some time before this Priene had been replaced by Naulochos as a political and social entity rests heavily on the observation that in a recently

discovered Argive list of *thearodokoi* dating from the 330s the name of Priene was omitted, that of Naulochos appearing instead. It is inconvenient that no ancient source mentions this important act of Alexander.

The treatment of Pytheos is curious. Van Berchem offers an interpretation of what Pytheos' book about the Temple really was, as opposed to what the text of Vitruvius says it was, and concludes that the Prienians had only the 'illusion' of possessing a Temple by Pytheos. Hornblower likewise plays down the importance of Pytheos, an 'obscure figure'. It is perhaps untrue, as Riemann maintained, that only twice as much was known about Herodotus, but Pytheos' surviving works have not been as carefully studied by historians. Hornblower's arguments for Alexander are much more extensive and include references to archaeological evidence other than the Temple: in support of the later date for the city he cites recent studies of the city wall.<sup>39</sup>

The arguments for the high chronology and those for a refounding by Alexander, which cannot easily be summarized here, are reviewed by Hornblower, who concludes that the weight of evidence favours the latter, though only 'marginally'. The evidence from the Temple should serve to narrow the gap.

The participation of the Hecatomnids was originally suggested by the documented presence of Pytheos: it is supported by another piece of evidence which also relates closely to Alexander. This is not a written document, but is in its way as eloquent as an inscription. The large female head found by Pullan in the cella, 85, is stylistically indistinguishable from the dynastic portraits of the Mausoleum and, as will be argued fully in Chapter V, it was very probably carved by a sculptor who worked there. The marble, probably Parian, is different from any used at Priene (see Appendix 2), though used for free-standing sculpture on the Mausoleum. If it were made expressly for the Temple and not moved there later, this would point strongly to the hand of Pytheos or a member of his crew, and a date shortly after his work on the Mausoleum.

Who is represented and what was her connection with the Temple? The answer proposed here involves a reconsideration of Alexander's policy towards the Greek cities within the area of Carian influence and the surrounding countryside, or *chora*, much of which remained the King's land.

It was a non-Greek act to dedicate a temple, in the first place, and in doing so Alexander was following a precedent established by Asiatic rulers (see Chapter IV). Among the earliest and most conspicuous examples of a ruler placing his name in a prominent place on a temple in the area of Asia Minor showing Greek influence were the dedications of Maussollos and Idrieus in the sanctuary of Zeus at Labranda.<sup>40</sup> Alexander must certainly have been aware of this — but in any event his wording follows the pattern of the Carian dynasties with one important change: he used his title, 'King'.

It was in keeping with Alexander's past behaviour that he should choose to associate himself again with Athena. He had sacrificed to her on first landing in Asia and again on the site of Troy. His devotions there as well as his abortive attempt to dedicate the Artemision at Ephesus suggest that his associating himself with the principal cults in the Greek cities of Asia Minor was not solely a reflection of his religiosity but also part of a policy of winning acceptance for himself and his rule. Is it pure coincidence that he should have wished his name on the Temple which replaced one bearing the inscription βασιλεὺς Κροίσος ἀνέθηκε,

'King Kroisos dedicated (this temple)' (on a moulding of a sculptural column drum), and that he used exactly the same formula to dedicate the Temple to Athena?<sup>41</sup>

Alexander, as Philip before him, cannot have been ignorant of the connection of Kroisos (Croesus) with the Temple of Artemis, which was recounted also by Herodotus (Book I, 92). For a commander contemplating conquest, the example of Croesus would seem an inappropriate one to emulate, but for Alexander's plans after Granicus, Croesus would have been an admirable model. He had, before his fatal defeat, conquered the Greek cities on the Ionian coast, but had remained friendly to them and patronized their cults. He was considered a paradigm of piety (and according to a version of his legend known at least by Bacchylides' time, he was saved from the pyre by Apollo and immortalized).<sup>42</sup>

By employing his Macedonian royal title, Alexander may perhaps have offended the Prienians to whom he had promised the autonomy of which their subsequent inscriptions proudly boast. In the context of Caria, however, it was particularly appropriate. Maussollos and Artemisia may not have called themselves King and Queen — though later writers often do — but they theoretically administered Caria for the great King. Alexander, in 334 B.C., had pressing needs. Might not the reference to his position as King have been part of a practical solution to the problem of revenue, or of a plan to justify a claim on the land outside the city walls? This belonged to 'the King' and was regularly let out to big landholders who worked it with serfs, the luckless *pedieis*.

In Alexander's decree for Naulochos, noted above, the autonomy of the citizens of Priene is underlined, as is the obligation for non-citizens living in the countryside to pay tribute. A garrison is mentioned, which would have ensured compliance. Possession of the *syntaxis* of the *chora* would have brought Alexander the income he very much required in the early stage of his conquest.

Priene — if indeed he ever visited it — would have been a brief pause in Alexander's advance towards Halicarnassus, which he successfully besieged in the following year (333 B.C.). The year of Granicus had marked the death of Pixodaros, who in 340 had usurped the satrapy from his sister, Ada, the widow of Idrieus. He had attempted to ally Caria to Macedonia through the marriage of his daughter Ada (the younger) to Philip's son Arrhidaios, much to the displeasure of Olympias and Alexander, but returned to the Persian fold. His eventual son-in-law Orontopates lost Halicarnassus, but Ada, who had survived the *coup* of 340, continued to represent the legitimate claim of the Carian rule. Her relationship with Alexander is recounted with touching detail by Arrian (I, 23, 1-6; II, 5, 7): she soon adopted him as her son and he, with filial devotion, restored her to her former position. She apparently died in about 331 B.C. (possibly later), and in this way Alexander became the ruler of Caria.

Both Alexander's choice of the Temple of Athena at Priene and his use of the title 'King' take on added significance if one is permitted to see in the idealized features of the great head in the cella those of Ada, his adoptive mother, patron of the city and its temple and the King's satrap.

In this conjectural reconstruction of the events surrounding the foundation of the Athena Temple and its dedication, a date shortly after 351 B.C. appears most probable for Pytheos' original plan and the beginnings of construction. Waywell has argued that the major work on the Mausoleum was finished at Artemisia's death.<sup>43</sup> If Pytheos did contribute to the project at Ephesus between his work at the Mausoleum and Priene, then perhaps work

began nearer the mid-340s. If it was funded at least in part by Idrieus and Ada, the death of Idrieus in 344 B.C. and the loss of the throne by Ada in 340 may very well have caused a cessation of the work, and given Alexander the opportunity for a good deed which would serve his ends in a very obvious way (while costing him little, it would seem. See p. 37 below). In this sense Alexander was 'lucky' to find this particular temple incomplete, and in need of a benefactor.

Pytheos' authorship is not, however, excluded by the later date for the new Priene. His career could well have extended from the 360s to the 320s. He might have begun work on it for Alexander in the 330s, though one wonders what he and his crew would have been doing for nearly two decades between the virtual completion of the Mausoleum in 351 B.C. and Alexander's commission. There was Ephesus, of course, and it has been suggested that Pytheos was involved in the work at Labranda, though as Hornblower points out, this is not likely. The work would, in this view, have also been begun while Ada was ruling (after her restoration) and her portrait might have been executed at Priene in the late 330s (although this is less likely, see above, p. 30, and Chapter V), or moved from the Mausoleum (also unlikely) at any time before her death. Alexander's dedication, all the same, may have been carved on the anta when the work had reached that point, rather than when it was finally complete. An important implication in the problem of the separate phases of the Temple (see p. 33 ff., below) is that the gap between the initiation and completion of the work would have to be reduced from a quarter century to a decade, if the latter date is accepted.

#### *Pytheos' plan*

The Temple of Athena was perhaps the single most influential building of the so-called 'Ionian renaissance' of the second half of the fourth century B.C. This must certainly have been due in part to Pytheos' book on the subject in which he elaborated his new canon of the Ionic order. For its principal characteristics the remains of the Temple are the most reliable witness (Vitruvius, who, as noted above, was surely familiar with Pytheos' writings, apparently did not rely extensively on them in describing his ideal Ionic temple, but seems rather to have preferred Hermogenes' work).

The plan is compact, six columns across the façade, eleven along the flanks, which form five and ten intercolumnar bays respectively — a ratio of 1:2. This results in a ratio of nearly 1:2 between the width and length of the Temple. The columns rest on a three-stepped base, characteristic of the Doric rather than of Ionic temples in Asia Minor. (The Doric, it should be noted, was generally criticized by Pytheos for its awkwardness.)

The measurements of the individual parts, as Schrader and Dörpfeld have shown, can be expressed as multiples of an Ionic foot of 0.295 m. (0.294 m. according to Dinsmoor), and are related in integral ratios. This is one of the most striking and characteristic features of Pytheos' design. The interior length of the cella, for example, is 50 ft., the pronaos 30 ft., the opisthodomos 12 ft., and the walls between, combined, measure 8 ft. The sum, the total length of the naos, not counting the projections of the antae at each end, is 100 ft. A column 43 ft. high results from assuming a ratio of 1:10 between lower diameter and height, as Penrose and Krischen did (but not Schrader, who argued for a ratio of 1:8½). The more slender column is in the Archaic tradition, which Pytheos made use of elsewhere in the building. According to Riemann, when the 7-ft. height on the entablature is added to that



of the column, the total height of the elevation, excluding the roof, is 50 ft. above the stylobate. This is equal to the interior length of the cella and results in a ratio of 1:2 between the basic vertical measure and the fundamental horizontal unit, the 100 ft. length of the naos.<sup>44</sup> (More recent work by Koenigs, however, casts some doubt on the validity of these calculations.) The basic vertical and horizontal dimensions thus interlock in a simple ratio, in a way reminiscent of an Ionian-influenced Doric temple of the late sixth century B.C., the Temple of Athena at Paestum.

The stylobate is like a chequer-board of imaginary squares, six Attic feet per side. The square plinths have this measurement (with the result that the lower diameter of the column cannot be expressed in an integral ratio of feet) and they alternate along the peristyle with open spaces 6 ft. wide. Elements of the interior structure, anta bases and columns of the opisthodomos and pronaos occupy squares of this grid or 'web' of measurements. Both in the overall proportions and in the relation of naos and peristyle the Temple shows some affinity with the Doric temples of the Peloponnese, such as the slightly older Temple of Asklepios at Epidaurus. Other features, such as the raised cella, are found in Asia Minor (Sardis, the Smintheion) and in western Greece, at an earlier date, but are unknown on the mainland.

Dörpfeld pointed out the Athena Temple's similarities to the Parthenon. The foundation and crepis were constructed in a similar but more striking way; the length of the naos, 100 ft., corresponds almost exactly with the length of the cella of the Parthenon, the 'hecatompedon' or 'hundred-footer' as it was known, and the width of the space flanked by the interior colonnade of the Parthenon is close to the width of the cella at Priene. (The metrological relations between the two buildings go even further, as will be discussed in Chapter IV.)

The close relationship between the interior structure and colonnade reflects the style of Archaic Ionic building, and is also a precondition for the enormous coffers covering a whole intercolumniation in the peristyle. These were square, deep (composed of three superimposed blocks) and ornamented with a variety of carved mouldings (see Chapter II below). They were a highly decorative element, which at the same time related directly to the structure of the building in a way that, with one exception, had no precedent in earlier buildings either in Asia Minor or on the Greek mainland. The great Archaic temples of Ionia such as the Artemision of Croesus may have had single coffers like these, but they would probably have been built of wood, and in any event no trace of them has been found. The earliest evidence for coffers the size of those Pytheos designed for the Temple of Athena is found among the architectural and sculptural remains of the Mausoleum.<sup>45</sup> Considering Pytheos' role in the work there, the over-sized coffer with sculptured lid is likely to have been one of his innovations, or at least perfected by him. It is seen again in the tomb at Belevi, which was influenced both by the Mausoleum and the Temple.<sup>46</sup>

The original system of overlapping coffer frames was already partially understood by Revett and Pullan (see fig. 5), but it remained for Schrader to relate it structurally to the rest of the building. This resulted in the elimination of the frieze, though an attempt was later made by Wilberg to reinstate it. A final correction by von Gerkan allowed some space (though not enough) for the coffer lid between the top of the highest block of the frame (Schrader's Block C) and the roof beams.<sup>47</sup>

No coffer lid fragments were reported by Schrader. No frieze slabs had been sighted by

Pullan, but the fragmentary reliefs which he finally restored as a frieze (but not to his or anyone else's complete satisfaction), as Praschniker was first to realize,<sup>48</sup> were the solutions to Schrader's quandary. The deep, elaborately moulded and brightly painted (red, blue, gold) coffering of Pytheos' temple — Schrader compared them with the stalactite coffers of a Turkish mosque — was from the first intended to frame the lively sculptured scenes of the relief. The coffer lid, with a complex composition like those of exterior friezes, as opposed to the single sculptured or painted head, should rank as one of the more daring and completely original inventions of the 'Ionian renaissance'. The credit for the design, if not for its installation at Priene must surely, as will be argued in Chapter II, belong to Pytheos. Its influence, however, was modest. For a while sculptured coffer lids were fashionable in Asia Minor and adjacent areas, as in the mausoleum at Belevi, and Propylon and Hieron at Samothrace,<sup>49</sup> but the taste did not spread.

The exterior of the building was left starkly simple, in contrast to Archaic, as well as fifth-century temples both in Asia Minor and mainland Greece. It was the interior which was embellished with figural representation and made to hold interest and surprises for the visitor. In an overall design for the Sanctuary Pytheos may well have intended that the Altar (see Chapter III) should complement the Temple, and have planned to concentrate the exterior sculptured decoration there.

The absence of a frieze in the entablature at Priene, as in the Mausoleum, was in keeping with Archaic Ionic practice. Pytheos ignored developments of the fifth century B.C. in this as in his design of column bases, which go back again to sixth-century models. His capitals, like his bases, are neither Attic nor Archaic; they are a new synthesis and one of the architect's lasting contributions to the development of the order.

#### *The completion of the Temple*

Newton believed that the Temple, except for the cult statue, was completed by Alexander's time, and this was the prevailing view for nearly half a century. Though Schrader noted considerable variation in the quality of the carving of ornamental elements, Schede was the first to hypothesize that the architecture belonged to two different periods, which he termed the 'Classical' and the 'Hellenistic' phases.<sup>50</sup> To the former he assigned the columns and capitals at the east end of the Temple, noting that the Lesbian cyma of the abacus was identical with that of the anta capital above the Alexander dedication, which he assumed therefore to belong to the first period. With these were associated the architrave blocks and coffer blocks which he found at the east end of the Temple. The floral decoration was compared to that of the Mausoleum: everything west of the wall dividing pronaos and cella, he felt, belonged to a later phase, characterized by rough and clumsy workmanship; the anta capitals from the west end were compared instead to ones from Magnesia. On this basis Schede concluded that the second phase belonged most probably to the mid-second century B.C., although he admitted that his results were preliminary and that other phases were possible. He proposed, in effect, that construction stopped after only part of the east end of the Temple was in place and was not finally completed until nearly 200 years later. Schede's theory has been refined and extended by subsequent studies, but there has never been a convincing explanation of the long pause. Von Gerkan's hypothesis that the differences are due to repairs after a widespread destruction during the brief reign of the Cappadocian

usurper Orophernes has generally been discounted for lack of evidence.<sup>51</sup> The only traces of burning in the Temple itself belong to its final destruction.

Parallels can and have been cited for long delays in the completion of temples. The Didymaion at Miletus is an obvious example, but it was in contrast an enormous undertaking that went on in stages. A better example is the Hieron at Samothrace, where the main structure was, according to Lehmann, completed in the fourth century B.C., but the sculptured coffer lids added only in the second. It would appear that there was a similar delay in installing coffers in their frames at the mausoleum at Belevi, though it is debatable whether as much as two centuries intervened.<sup>52</sup>

There are differences, undoubtedly. These are perhaps clearest in the execution of the ovolo mouldings: those of blocks of the entablature from the east end are full, rounded and crisp, while those generally found on the west are thin and pointed with blurred edges. The weaknesses of Schede's theory are threefold. Firstly, how sure is it that pieces of coffer frames, for instance, found at the east end actually came from the east and were not brought there later, after the excavation? As outlined above, Pullan's notebooks with their precise indications of the 'find-spots' of many of the blocks on the grid offer students of the architecture of the Temple a useful tool, as well as a check on Schede's results.

Secondly, it is by no means obvious from the coffer frames that the differences in the carving of ornaments correspond with only two major, widely separated, building periods. The differences, for example, in the lotus-palmette cyma mouldings of the upper blocks of the coffer frame (Block C, see Chapter II) are very pronounced, but they fall into what appears to this observer to be five distinct types. They are: (1) a 'fleur-de-lys' lotus and divided leaf palmette, six examples typified by B.M. Cat. 1132. This block closely resembles one drawn by Pullan and therefore can be tentatively said to come from square A6, the south-west corner of the Temple; (2) a 'bowl' form lotus and undivided palmette leaf. There are seven examples of this, of which the most impressive is the most fully preserved frame on the site at the west end of the Temple, with two corners still intact. Pullan's notes prove that this was located in square B6 at the time of the excavation. Here, then, are two very different mouldings, both found at the south-west corner of the Temple; (3) a 'fleur-de-lys' lotus, solid leaf palmette with large circular volute (for example, B.M. Cat. 1139): this is most like a fragment Schede noted at the east end of the Temple, although more regular and carefully executed; (4) a divided lotus and palmette leaf. There are two examples of this, one in Berlin and one in Priene; (5) a tulip-shaped lotus, solid leaf palmette. The one example of this is at Priene. The most crudely executed moulding belongs to the second group and it is currently below the Temple towards the east end. Of the fourteen fragments considered only one would qualify as 'Classical' according to Schede's definition; the division into numerous types, rather than just two, shows that many hands of varying skill were at work on the coffer frames using different patterns and perhaps working at different times.

Finally, if Schede's division is accepted in general, how secure is the dating of the second phase to the mid-second century B.C.? There is clearly a resemblance between ornament of Schede's second phase and that, for example, of the capitals of the Temple of Artemis at Magnesia. The ovolos are thin and pointed, the bead-and-reel elongated, and the Lesbian leaf is that with stems which flare out at the base. Clearly there is a decline in the quality of carved decoration between the mid-fourth and the late third or second centuries B.C. in

Asia Minor. Can one be sure that it did not begin earlier than has been hitherto suggested, perhaps even in the fourth century B.C.? Similar flat Lesbian leaf, for example, has been attributed to the superstructure of the Altar at Ephesus, which was completed around 300 B.C.<sup>53</sup>

The mid-second century date has had an obvious attraction. It has made possible the attribution of the completion of the Temple to Orophernes (p. 235), who on tenuous grounds has been linked to numerous building projects at Priene. This question is dealt with extensively in Chapter IV. Suffice it to say that the completion of the Temple and design of the cult statue would have required careful planning and co-ordination covering several years at least. Assuming that two years were enough, would Orophernes have found the opportunity between 158 and 156 B.C., say, to complete the west end of the Temple including the coffering and lids, roof it, and dedicate the image of Athena? The coins bearing his portrait found in the base of the cult statue do support the claim that he dedicated it, but evidence linking him to the Temple itself, except as a depositor (see Chapter IV), is completely lacking.

Schede's position, though maintained in general outline, has been modified and made more subtle in recent studies by Bauer<sup>54</sup> and Koenigs which represent a great deal of careful observation. There is no longer the insistence that the second phase need belong to the second century B.C. It could, they believe, have been in the third also, though according to Koenigs this is less likely. Bauer, whose results have been published in a preliminary form, noted a seam in the foundation of the north side at the seventh column from the east, which he maintains could not have been caused by a shift in the ground. In the entablature near the fifth column from the east there is an unfinished dentil and under it an unfinished egg-and-dart. Bauer believed that this could indicate that the Temple was completed in the north by working from the west towards the east end, an unusual procedure which does not conform to the evidence from other sites, such as Epidaurus and Delphi.<sup>55</sup> He concluded that the foundation in the east, south and west was contemporary and that the larger western part of the north side was the last to be executed. In differentiating the capitals as 'Classical' and 'Hellenistic' Bauer drew attention to variations in the diameter of the echinus and the use of marble for the separately made 'eye' of the former (for example B.M. Cat. 1125 where the lead fastening but no trace of an eye remains) and of terracotta for the latter. He noted an especially sharp difference in the corner capitals of the east and west ends.

Koenigs, who is preparing the definitive publication of the architecture, attributes to phase one the entire cella (except possibly its pavement), the columns of the opisthodomos and the east end of the peristyle as far as the first four columns on the north and south sides. The plinths of these (as observed by Bedford as early as 1812, see above) are treated in a different way from the rest. They are of uniform thickness and are sunk into the sloping slab of the stylobate which has been cut into and levelled to receive them, whereas to the west the plinth is made to slope to compensate for the angle of the pavement (the columns themselves were not inclined). Phase two saw the completion of the building and to it, according to Koenigs, should be attributed all the blocks with the inferior carved decoration. There are further, he noted, perceptible differences in the stone: it is basically the same, but a large number of blocks of phase two have a prominent grain running through them, which ranges in colour from blue to grey and yellow (some, however, are of the purer white marble used in phase one). On the whole the whiter stone was reserved for the decorative parts such as the capitals.

On one of the best executed lion's head spouts (from the eastern end of the Temple, now in Miletus) Koenigs has observed an A with a curved crossbar, used as a mason's mark. Conversely the normal straight-bar A is found in second-phase blocks. A similar curved-bar A occurs on a section of sima now in the British Museum (B.M. Cat. 1130.1) which, though it has phase-one forms, is of inferior workmanship. Both types of A are found on an important inscription, probably of the time of Alexander, at Priene (see below). The curved type, however, resembles the broken-bar A which is common only from the second century B.C. Koenigs has suggested that the apparently late mark on the early block might be a sign that the lion's head spout had been executed during phase one but stored and put into place at the time the building was completed.

These studies of the architecture of the Temple have established that only the east end was to any degree complete at the time of Alexander's dedication. Clearly, it was complete to the level of the anta and perhaps higher. (The claim that Alexander would not have dedicated a temple which did not have its pediment in place overlooks the fact that he was apparently willing to do so at Ephesus.)

If Krischen's relative dating of the construction of the Ephesus and Priene Temples is accepted, then the entablature cannot have been in place at Ephesus before the Priene Temple was finished — otherwise, according to Krischen, its influence would be apparent on the capitals of the Priene Temple, which is not the case.<sup>56</sup> The simas of Ephesus, however, seem to reflect those of Priene. Strabo's account (mentioned above), in any event, proves that the Artemision was incomplete when Alexander offered to pay for it. The scaffolding may have been removed for the occasion, but it need not be assumed that a cult statue and altar had to be present for a temple dedication to take place.

#### *Megabyzos*

Surprisingly little attention has been paid to a remarkably complete and detailed inscription (*IvPr*, no. 3) which relates directly to the question of the completion of the Temple. It records honours to a certain Megabyzos of Ephesus for 'completing the temple' (περι τοῦ ναοῦ τῆς [Ἀθηνᾶς] τὴν συντέλειαν). However it is to be interpreted, there can be little doubt about the meaning: Athena's Temple must be meant, as the only one dedicated to a goddess under construction at this time, which would have been important enough to justify such honour for its benefactor. Megabyzos is granted a golden crown, the status of *proxenos*, the right to hold a very considerable amount of property (but not that of the *pedieis*), in return for his good deed. In addition a bronze statue to him and a stele recording the decree are to be erected in the Sanctuary of Athena, in front of the Temple (ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ [τῆς Ἀθηνᾶς] πρὸ [τοῦ με]τωπίου τοῦ ναοῦ). The expense for statue and decree was apparently in part at least to be borne by Megabyzos himself. Similar treatment was accorded very important people (such as Lysimachos, *IvPr*, no. 14); therefore it can be inferred that Megabyzos made a truly handsome contribution to the Temple. It is important to note that the curved-bar A is used in the Megabyzos inscription and also as a mason's mark on the sima block with lion's head spout belonging to phase one as well as on the one of poorer quality mentioned above.

Remarkably, the base of a statue of Megabyzos has been found (*IvPr*, no. 231) built into the Byzantine church (which has yielded a good number of fragments from the Athena

Sanctuary). The letter forms are very close to those of the Alexander dedication; it reads [Μεγάβυζος] Μεγάβυζου νεωκόρος τῆς Ἀρτέμιδος τῆς ἐν Ἐφέσῳ, 'Megabyzos, son of Megabyzos, Neokoros of Artemis of the Ephesians'. The decree has been dated shortly after Granicus, and is later than one of presumed 334 B.C. date (*IvPr*, no. 2), as the *stephanephoros* is named, rather than the eponymous magistrate of the prytany.<sup>57</sup> There is, however, no certain lower limit for its date, and it might conceivably be later than Alexander's lifetime. In relative terms it is one year before the two decrees honouring Apellis (*IvPr*, no. 4) for twenty years' service as *grammateus* and as a commander. These have often been cited to prove that Priene was in existence in 351 B.C., but once again there is no proof that they are not later than their earliest possible dates (332/331 B.C. and 327/326 B.C. respectively).

Megabyzos was a common name. Strabo (xiv, 1, 65) says that all priests of Artemis were eunuchs called Megabyzos, and Megabyzos was (remarkably) the son of another by the same name, so it may be the purest coincidence that Apelles painted a portrait of a Megabyzos and also one of Alexander for the Temple of Artemis. A connection between Alexander and the priests of Artemis, if not the one painted by Apelles (or the one honoured by Priene), is suggested by the fact that Alexander, departing from the usual practice, remitted the tribute that the Ephesians were forced to keep paying, to the Temple of Artemis. Presumably, in this way Alexander had his revenge on the Ephesians by forcing them to pay for the completion of their temple themselves.

Megabyzos was specifically a *neokoros* of Artemis — in effect a warden of the Temple — and may have been in a position to handle and disburse the income of the goddess. The Attalids, as Rostovtzeff noted,<sup>58</sup> used a simple stratagem to get at the rich temple treasures of cities that fell into their power: they appointed their own man as *neokoros*. Could Alexander through Megabyzos have used the Ephesian tribute money to complete not only the Artemision but also the Temple the Prienians allowed him to dedicate as well? He did in fact keep in touch with a Megabyzos (Plutarch, *Alexander*, 42) up to the time of his death in 324/323 B.C.

Wilamowitz suggested that the subject of the portrait, the benefactor, and the correspondent of Alexander might have been one and the same.<sup>59</sup> If so, this Megabyzos could have been expected to help with the Temple at any time during Alexander's lifetime. Assuming the higher chronology for Priene to be correct, the most likely sequence would seem to be: Ada and Idrieus begin the Temple, Alexander and Megabyzos finish it, probably in Ada's lifetime. In the lower chronology the construction would have been telescoped into the period between 334 B.C. and Alexander's death. The satrapy was Ada's again until her death in about 331 B.C. or later. After that Philoxenos, a Macedonian appointee of Alexander, was in control, and would certainly have supported any attempt to complete the Temple.

If the Megabyzos of the inscription was unrelated to Alexander, then the inscription could possibly refer to a completion of the Temple later in the fourth century B.C. In either event the old argument that it was not finished in the fourth century, because Alexander did not have the money (based on Arrian, 1, 20, 1), repeated by von Gerkan, Schede and Riemann, cannot be valid if the inscription means what it says.

Considerations of the architectural and epigraphical evidence lead to two very different conclusions about the date of the completion of the Temple. The Megabyzos inscription puts it very probably in the third quarter of the fourth century B.C., but certainly before the

third century, while the arguments of Bauer, though they allow for greater flexibility in the dating than Schede's, make it clear that a considerable gap is indicated between the two phases. There is, however, a further piece of evidence which is fundamental to this question, as well as to the principal concerns of this book — the architectural sculpture.

#### *The relief sculpture*

##### (a) Function

The numerous reliefs which Pullan found in and around the peristyle of the Temple and brought back to the British Museum have been variously identified. Pullan in the end concluded that they were from the exterior frieze of the entablature, where he eventually restored them (see pl. VI*b*). The technical details puzzled all students and the mistaken information that the reliefs were found inside the Temple (see above, p. 19) in the cella or pronaos led them all astray. Schrader argued that they decorated the base of the cult statue,<sup>60</sup> but he may not have known that the number of extant fragments was far too great for this, as only a handful had been published at the time of his writing. There was as yet no definitive list and there was not to be one until now. Thomas, who had actually examined the material in London, thought that the reliefs formed a balustrade in front of the cult statue. In his graphic reconstruction of the cella, however, they form a frieze around the interior, like that of the Apollo Temple at Bassae. A balustrade, but without a specified use, was Wolters's solution.

Finally, von Gerkan removed them from the Temple altogether and placed them in the base of the Altar in front of it. His idea was elaborated with such thoroughness that it still has supporters. Over forty years ago Praschniker made a little-heeded but eminently sensible suggestion, which is also the correct solution, as will be shown in Chapter II.<sup>61</sup> Using the similar and better-preserved examples from the great tomb of Belevi (near Ephesus) as a parallel, he argued that they were coffer lids. Of the various parts of the building, the coffer lids would have been the last to be put in place before the building was roofed. They are not essential to the structure and could have been put up at any time providing the roof were temporarily removed, but they could not be put up until the peristyle, supporting framework of the coffering and entablature — in short, the Temple — were structurally complete.

##### (b) Style

Early investigators considered that the reliefs were in one way or another part of the Temple they believed Alexander finished; quite naturally they assumed that the reliefs were also of that period. Their subject matter, identified first as an Amazonomachy, was later seen to include, even more prominently, a gigantomachy. Overbeck saw in them a precursor of the gigantomachy of the Altar of Zeus at Pergamon, discovered a decade after Pullan's excavation; Furtwängler was the first to argue that far from leading the way they merely echoed the great masterpiece, and this judgement has until very recently been restated with further details (for example, by Wolters and Schober), but never questioned. None of these scholars, however, was acquainted with more than a small part of the Priene material.<sup>62</sup>

As long as the reliefs were relegated to the Altar they had no effect on attempts to date the Temple. As will be discussed more fully below (see p. 40) and in Chapter III, von Gerkan dated the Altar to the mid-second century B.C. and attributed it to Orophernes. This was in complete accord with Furtwängler's post-Pergamene dating of the reliefs. Once it has been admitted that the reliefs were temple decoration, the date of the sculpture, based on stylistic arguments, becomes inextricably and fundamentally involved with the question of the completion of the building. There is general agreement that at least the east end of the Temple was finished as high as the anta capitals, if not higher, for Alexander's dedication. If the coffers with the better style of decoration were in place, then only some — say nine — of them could possibly have been given sculptured lids at this time. According to Schede's theory in its modified form the remaining seventeen or so would then have been of later date. This is the compromise solution adopted by Praschniker. He assigned the Amazonomachy, of which fewer securely identified fragments have survived, to the east end and the gigantomachy to the presumed later west end, which, if Schede were correct, would have been nearly 200 years later.

There are some individual differences among the relief and fragments which have been assigned to the coffers, but — to summarize in a few words the discussion in Chapter II — there is also a remarkable stylistic homogeneity. There are, for example, instances where a figure from a gigantomachy panel and a fragmentary Amazon appear to be by the same hand. The obvious gap between groups of the carved architectural mouldings has no counterpart here. The style is further closely comparable to that of the Mausoleum, allowing for the differences in composition and relief technique imposed by the shape and conditions of the space in which they were displayed. As will be shown in Chapter II, the similarities are so striking as to make it nearly certain that some of the same sculptors were involved in both projects. There are no really convincing parallels for this relief style in the second or third centuries B.C. The full evidence clearly indicates that all the coffers were ready for installation in the third quarter of the fourth century B.C., and vindicates the early opinions of Murray and Overbeck that the sculpture belonged stylistically to the original project.

Can a fourth-century date for the sculpture be reconciled with a considerably later one for the west end of the Temple? The lids could, of course, have been lowered into their frames at any time without any structural alteration of the building, so it is theoretically possible at least for the coffer reliefs to have been designed by Pytheos and executed by his crew (or by that of his successor) and then stored away until the frames on both ends were complete, decades or centuries later — but is it likely?

A further possibility, suggested by Bammer,<sup>63</sup> might be considered: that the peristyle and coffering were erected in the fourth century B.C. with the contribution of Megabyzos, but that there was a delay in the completion of the decorative mouldings on the blocks once they were *in situ*. In this way a long chronological gap between phases of moulding could be maintained, but it would be deprived of any structural significance. Carving of architectural detail, once the elements such as the simas were in place, would have assured continuity in the decorative patterns, that the ovolos of the echinus lined up perfectly with the flutes of the columns, and so forth. This is documented elsewhere and is perhaps supported at Priene by Bauer's observation of incomplete mouldings in the entablature of the north flank.<sup>64</sup> Some carving *in situ* is implied by this. The various different elements in

the patterns of the mouldings of the highest coffer frame noted earlier may reflect the efforts of a corresponding number of workmen — efforts undertaken independently and clearly without a common paradigm or model. Had all the frames been carved on the ground, even in two periods, greater uniformity should have resulted. This hypothesis would reconcile the evidence of the style of the mouldings with that of the style of the reliefs, without requiring a very radical reinterpretation of the *'synteleisis'* of the Megabyzos decree. If, however, these additional hypotheses — either storage of the reliefs or later carving of the mouldings — should be excluded, then one of two more fundamental positions must be considered: either that the sculpture is much later, and therefore much more conservative than it appears to be, and the Megabyzos decree is simply a gross exaggeration, or that the difference in the moulding styles corresponds with a gap of at most a quarter of a century from the beginning of the Temple soon after 350 B.C., until its completion at the latest, probably before Alexander's death. Clearly a final word on this complex problem cannot even be considered until the full evidence of the architecture is available.

#### *The Altar*

In *Antiquities of Ionia*, iv, Pullan devoted exactly three sentences of his report to the Altar. He announced the discovery of an 'oblong structure of Graeco-Roman times', contradicted his letters and notebook by saying that no elements were found which could be used to reconstruct the superstructure, and offered his identification of the building as an Altar. His plan (*Ant. Ionia*, iv, pl. 5), taken over from Falkener's of 1845, may reflect his own observations, and he appears to have remeasured it (see Chapter III). In fact, in his unpublished reconstruction of the Sanctuary (pl. VIb) he proves he understood something of the upper part of the structure. The study of the Altar, however, began in earnest with Schrader. He rediscovered a number of the blocks which Pullan had recorded in his notebook, but by this time the relatively well-preserved structure which Pullan had uncovered was reduced to a shapeless core. The steps were gone and the 'podia' blocks scattered about the site. Schrader found all but a few of the elements and produced a complete and essentially correct reconstruction of the Altar.

Dörpfeld, followed by von Gerkan, challenged Schrader's solution. It is clear that they were motivated, at least in part, by a desire to find in the Priene Altar clues to the reconstruction of the Altar of Zeus at Pergamon. They raised Schrader's structure and inserted a base between it and the steps. No new discoveries of additional elements were cited to support the case, but von Gerkan, as noted earlier, found a useful way to dispose of the problematical relief sculptures. More recently, Bauer has collected some additional fragments of relief. The evidence will be fully discussed in Chapter III.

Everyone who has studied the remaining architecture and sculpture, beginning with Pullan, has concluded that the Altar is of more recent date than the Temple, and in this they are surely correct — but how long after the Temple was the Altar begun? Schrader did not specify, but compared it to the Sarcophagus of the Mourning Women of the fourth century B.C. Von Gerkan has argued that the Altar is one more sign of the beneficence of Orophernes. His supporting evidence was the form of the Altar, as reconstructed by him, which he maintained was influenced by the Great Altar of Pergamon. This provides a

*terminus post quem*. To this he added a 'correction' of Schrader's observation of the relation between the pavement leading up to and around the Altar, the Altar and the Temple.

Schrader thought that the pavement had been laid once the Temple and Altar were in place. Von Gerkan reinterpreted the evidence of tool marks and concluded that the pavement preceded the Altar. Next he argued that the pavement of the terrace and that of the cella floor were laid at the same date, on stylistic grounds. Since, he argued, the cella floor could not have predated Orophernes' cult-statue base, neither could the pavement of the terrace, and therefore the Altar. Recently, Linfert has shown that the cella floor was almost certainly altered for the introduction of the cult-statue base. It is also clear that the pour-channels of the Altar foundation would have been unusable once the terrace pavement was in place. If one accepts the link between the two pavements, then the Altar certainly predates the cult-statue base. The claim that the two pavements are contemporary, on the basis of style, is open to serious doubt, and it is impossible to confirm. Only Pullan's plan, his notebook drawings and the pry-holes of the polygonal foundation remain to indicate the cella pavement plan.

Using Pullan's documentation it has been possible to reconstruct the Altar with near certainty — it was a low altar, as Schrader believed — and to identify a figure of a seated Muse in Istanbul as a part of its sculptural decoration. A stylistic study of the reliefs has led to the conclusion that the Altar should be dated to the last quarter of the third century B.C., as will be argued in Chapter III.

#### *Later alterations*

The principal buildings of the Sanctuary, the Temple and Altar, belong to its earlier history, but activity did not cease through the long period of its life. Striking evidence for the continuity of worship here, and of the importance of cult, are the dedicatory inscriptions. These, which were collected along with the rest of the epigraphical material from the site by Hiller von Gaertringen, form a series which begins with Alexander and trails off in the third century of the Imperial era. Of particular interest here are those which belong to statue bases set up in the Sanctuary. Some of these, though found elsewhere, were originally erected in the Sanctuary. The Megabyzos base came to light in a Byzantine construction, but the Megabyzos decree (*IvPr*, no. 3) proves that it was set up before the Temple. More than half the bases date from Augustan times or later. Four are certainly Augustan, and perhaps others as well, and they show that portraits of the Imperial family and close associates were set up in the Sanctuary at regular intervals.

Many of these statues must have been of bronze and have long since been destroyed. Of the surviving sculptures in stone found in the cella and pronaos of the Temple more than half, again, are of Imperial date, such as a head of Claudius, 91, and several cuirassed torsos without heads. Probably also of Imperial date are the fragments of a colossal male statue, and the toe of a super-colossal figure, which must have been twice as large as the Athena and could not possibly have been set up inside the Temple.

All this material should be viewed in relation to the rededication of the Sanctuary, some time after 27 B.C., to Athena Polias and Augustus: this fact is, as noted above, advertised by very conspicuous inscriptions. In addition to the Temple, the Altar and perhaps also a holy water basin (*IvPr*, no. 158) were reassigned to the divine pair, a fact which gave the

cult a renewed vitality as well as a considerably altered focus. It also poses some questions which have received little if any attention in previous studies. Was there, for example, a new cult statue for the new divinity? If so, where was it located? These questions will be taken up in Chapter V, which deals with the free-standing sculptures from the Temple.

Some at least of the architectural modifications of the Sanctuary must belong to this period (see plan, fig. 1). The transformation of the opisthodomos into a closed space with a door, perhaps a treasury, may belong to an Augustan modernisation, as Schede has suggested. The only evidence here is the moulding of the door, which Koenigs believes might just as well have belonged to the second century B.C. (that is, to his second phase of the Temple).

At a later date the entire Sanctuary was given a new frame. The south side was closed off by a long stoa with Doric columns, seen in both Gell's and Cockerell's drawings (pl. Ia and b), which was parallel to the flank of the Temple and left a passageway about 6 m. wide between it and the Temple. The stoa opened to the south (not, as Falkener believed, towards the Temple), with a view out over the whole lower city, the Maeander Valley and the Gulf of Latmos to the west, and on a clear day the site of Herakleia on the distant side of the Valley was visible. The creation of the panoramic covered walk effectively blocked the former magnificent view of the Temple from below, which was one of the most impressive and satisfying aspects of the city plan (pl. IIa).

Such a change would have outraged Pytheos and the Prienians of former days. Who was responsible? Schrader pointed out that the north wall of the stoa was built over statue bases which must have held dedications in the Sanctuary, and its south wall presupposes the completion of the rusticated terrace wall, which was not built all in one stage. This points to a late date, as does the technique of the foundations, made of rough-shaped stones but not reused material (as were some of the other smaller buildings of the Sanctuary and the Propylon). Koenigs believes that it belongs to the first or second century B.C. and is a Hellenistic rather than a Roman idea.

The Propylon has, instead, generally been dated to the first century B.C. or the Augustan period. It was planned, it would seem, after the present Altar was complete, since it is angled, as observed earlier, so that the visitor could take in both the south-east corner of the Altar and the Temple on first entering the Sanctuary. Though perhaps of slightly different periods, stoa and Propylon have a similar intention — to prescribe a certain way of viewing the buildings and monuments, to direct the visitor and guide his approach. The concept may be Hellenistic in origin, but it was typical of Roman practice.

Inside the Sanctuary, once the initial feeling created by the sculptured Altar and outwardly sculptureless Temple had subsided, the visitor would find himself confronting rows of statues lining the blank north wall of the stoa on his left, and on his right a similar row parallel to the north side of the Altar and approximately equidistant from it. Behind this row was a small building which has been described as a 'temple-in-antis' (though no trace of a column has been found) or a 'treasury'. Beside it are the remains of houses of late date. Several at least of these bases belonged, as Pullan's drawings (IV, 56<sup>v</sup>, fig. 27 here) and the extant remains of seats show, to exedrae. The inscribed capital of the enclosure wall of one of these is conserved in the British Museum (B.M. Cat. 1136, pl. Va, foreground). Here the visitor could rest and refresh himself.

Separate, and set off from the rest, are four more rather large bases, two at the west end

of the Temple (one certainly belonged to a small building), one at the north-east corner of the Temple, and the fourth just to the right of the Propylon (see plan, fig. 1). In addition there were numerous smaller monuments, such as cylindrical statue bases, pillars with elaborate capitals — one now in the British Museum (B.M. Cat. 1135) and several on the site — which supported bronze statues (pl. Va, centre foreground). These latter are very probably of the second century B.C.

No plan incorporates all the monuments seen by Pullan, Schrader and Bauer. It is to be hoped that the architectural study now in progress will shed further light on them, the Propylon and stoa, the lesser known facets of the Sanctuary's middle age.

## CHAPTER V

## DEDICATIONS IN THE SANCTUARY

OF the sculptures Pullan brought to England the most prominent group, numerically, are the free-standing ones. There are nine heads and larger fragments, and many smaller pieces, making 100 in all. Several of these, the large female head, **85**, and the male portraits, **90** and **91**, are among the best-known works from the site. These have been discussed on various occasions in studies dealing with the Mausoleum and with late Hellenistic and Imperial portraits (see bibliographies in individual catalogue entries). Although the place of discovery has usually been noted, the full significance of the fact that they are from the interior of the Temple has for some reason escaped notice. Why were these portraits, one of which was clearly of the Emperor Claudius, there in the first place? Surely it has to do with the rededication of the Temple after 27 B.C. to Athena and the *praesens divus*, Augustus. At this time it very probably became, like the Metroon at Olympia and the Temples of Athena at Ilion and Pergamon (see p. 265 below), a repository of portraits of Augustus and his family.

Many Imperial portraits in Asia Minor and elsewhere are recorded only by the dedicatory inscriptions on the surviving statue bases. The Sanctuary of Athena has also produced a rich harvest for the epigrapher, and includes several bases which go back to the early years of the cult of Athena in the refounded Priene, as well as a large number of Hellenistic, pre-Imperial dedications. Nearly half fall into the latter category (see Table J).

It should be possible, using both the inscriptions and the fragmentary remains of the statues themselves, to form a clearer idea of the physical appearance of the principal sanctuary in successive periods than is possible for most sites, and at the same time to shed some light on the political and social life of a Hellenistic and Roman provincial city and its wider contacts. Here, as elsewhere in Asia Minor, the Temple and the Sanctuary remained the single most important receptacles of sculpture.<sup>1</sup>

What gives the Priene material a particular importance is that it is now possible to know with a good deal of precision where the statues came from. Pullan's records place five of the best preserved in the Temple (Table M), and more specifically divides those in the pronaos from the special group which occupied the cella. His description of the excavation of the interior of the Temple (Chapter I) explains why the statues that were there have been so well preserved, and it makes it almost certain that any fragment with clear signs of burning must have been found either in the pronaos or the cella. This brings the total number of sculptures in the Temple, when it was destroyed, to about a dozen: there may have been more, but they have left no trace. This number is in rough agreement with the count of statue bases, which appear in Pullan's photographs and drawings of the cella and pronaos (see Table M for references). There were seven normal-sized bases: two rectangular ones in the cella, and two cylindrical and three rectangular, as well as some smaller bases (perhaps

for stelae) in the pronaos. Not every statue in the Temple need have had a base, and there was in fact nothing of sufficient size (to judge from the photographs) to accommodate the considerably over life-sized image of Ada, **85**. It is much to be regretted that neither Pullan nor Newton made notes of the inscriptions on the bases which were found in the Temple. In fact, the notebooks record only the dedication of a certain Marcus Antonius Rusticus on the steps from cella to pronaos (*IvPr*, no. 159) and the dedications of Alexander on the anta and Augustus on the architrave of the Temple and Altar (*IvPr*, nos. 156-8). By 1870, when Murray visited the site, these would have been scattered, and the destruction which Mr. Clarke vividly recounted after his visit in the same year (Chapter IV) was well under way. Perhaps some of the inscriptions of the seven bases from the Temple are among those recorded generally for the site (Table J). Others may, like the dedication of Rusticus, have disappeared without a trace. As is the case at so many other sites, it is impossible to connect, even with a fair degree of probability, a single surviving statue with any of the extant inscriptions.

## 1. THE INSCRIPTIONS

The evidence of the inscriptions is of fundamental importance, despite the fact that it leads to no secure identifications. Collectively they do indicate who, in what period, for what reasons, and in certain cases in what form, was honoured with an image in the Sanctuary. The basic information has been collected in Table J, but requires some elaboration.

*The occasion**Pre-Imperial dedications*

Among the statue-dedications of the pre-Imperial period in the Sanctuary, surprisingly, none to a ruler has survived. Lysimachos (*IvPr*, no. 14), Orophernes<sup>2</sup> and undoubtedly others were commemorated, but their images seem to have been located elsewhere. Instead, the surviving inscriptions mention only three persons whose fame securely extended beyond Priene. The earliest and one of the most fully documented dedications is that to Megabyzos, the *Neokoros* of Artemis at Ephesus, and a major contributor to the building of the Temple (see Chapter I). He was honoured with a bronze statue (*εἰκῶν*) whose inscribed square base has survived. According to common practice, he himself paid, at least partially, for his portrait (*ἀνδριάς* — *IvPr*, nos. 3, 17) and the honour of having it stand before the Temple which bore Alexander's dedication.

The other surviving inscribed base of the fourth century is of a type familiar in sanctuaries all over the Greek world in all periods. A father dedicated an image, for his daughter, Nikó(?), who was a priestess, to Athena. It is tempting to associate this inscription and the portrait of a young aristocratic girl which can be dated to the same period (**86**). The dedication is a private one, and appropriately does not go into detail about the type of statue or the reason for the dedication. Although bronze was perhaps favoured for honorary statues of an official nature at a later date,<sup>3</sup> the evidence of the other surviving sculptures of the fourth century, **84** and **85**, would indicate that for the early dedications marble was often employed.

The location of the base with the statue of Nikó was not recorded by von Gaertringen in

TABLE J. Inscribed statue bases from the Sanctuary and fragmentary statues, listed according to period

<i>IvPr</i> no.	<i>Person</i> <i>honoured</i>	<i>Conferred</i> <i>by, reason</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Type</i> <i>of base</i>	<i>Type</i> <i>of statue</i>	<i>Find-spot</i>
FOURTH CENTURY B.C.						
1. 231	Megabyzos ( <i>Neokoros</i> )	Boule and Demos by decree ( <i>IvPr</i> , 3)	c. 334 B.C. (see Ch. I)	rectangular?	(inscription) bronze εἰκὼν	'later house south of Byzantine church'
2. 160	Nikó(?) (priestess to Athena Polias)	Menedemos (her father)	c. 331 B.C.	rectangular		
THIRD CENTURY B.C.						
3. 249	Apollonides	Deme of Pandionis ' <i>eunoia</i> '		exedra		Sanctuary (1870) B.M. Cat. 429 (inscription) B.M. Cat. 1136 (sculpture)
4. 252	Thrasyboulos (Phrourarch) and family	Phrouroi of Teloneiai		large rect- angular(?) base for several figures		Sanctuary
5. 274	son of Demetrios	by decree		rectangular lower moulding		near Byzantine basilica
SECOND CENTURY B.C.						
6. 253	Thrasyboulos, son of Thrasyboulos		2nd half of 2nd century			
7. 256	—ippos	Ionian Koinon		rectangular		before the Propylon, proba- bly from the Sanctuary
8. 234	Philios, son of Thrasyboulos	Demos, victor in the Pankration at Dodona				Sanctuary (1765)
9. 254	Thrasyboulos	Demos(?)		square		private house SE. of Propylon
10. 272	Sotades, son of Sotades	Lysimachos and Aischylos by decree		rectangular(?)		foundation of Propylon
11. 138			2nd half of 2nd century (Riemann)		(inscription) bronze εἰκὼν	SE. corner of Sanctuary
12. 55	Dionysios of Priene, priest of Nikomedes II of Bithynia		128/127 B.C. (Riemann)		(no mention of statue)	probably from Sanctuary (Riemann)
FIRST CENTURY B.C.						
13. 244	Manius Aemilius, son of Manius	Demos(?)	84-78 B.C. (Tuchelt)	square	'bronze statue' ( <i>IvPr</i> )	stairs from Temple to agora
14. 281	Zopurine, daughter of Menekrates					Sanctuary

Table J (continued)

<i>IvPr</i> no.	<i>Person</i> <i>honoured</i>	<i>Conferred</i> <i>by, reason</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Type</i> <i>of base</i>	<i>Type</i> <i>of statue</i>	<i>Find-spot</i>
15. 240	—tiskos	Demos	'not earlier than first century B.C.' (Hicks)	'bluish marble' rectangular		Sanctuary (1870)
AUGUSTAN						
16. 225	Julia ' <i>kalliteknos</i> ' (daughter of Augustus)	Demos	16-13 B.C. (Riemann)	rectangular		B.M. Cat. 428 (inscription) Sanctuary (1870)
17. 226	Lucius Julius Caesar	Demos	before A.D. 2 (Riemann)	rectangular(?)		Sanctuary
18. 223	Emperor (Augustus[?])			square (large letters)		Sanctuary
19. —	Drusus (brother of Tiberius[?])	Demos	before 9 B.C. (unpublished)	fragmentary, cylindrical		east of Temple
20. 247	Gnaeus Pompeius (Macer?) Procurator	Demos	Augustan (Tuchelt)	rectangular 'white marble'	'marble statue' ( <i>IvPr</i> )	between Altar and Temple in front of stoa (1891)
21. 222	priest of Rome and Augustus			cylindrical		altar of Byzantine basilica
22. 161	to Athena		Augustan ( <i>IvPr</i> and Hicks)	letters 2 in. high		Temple (1870)
JULIO-CLAUDIAN						
23. 227	Tiberius	Ionian Koinon		rectangular(?)		pavement Byzantine basilica
24. 228	Drousilla (Thea)		after A.D. 38	square		Byzantine basilica
IMPERIAL, UNDATED						
25. 239	Theodotos	Demos ' <i>arete</i> and <i>eunoia</i> '				Sanctuary(?) (1870)
26. 224	Emperor			rectangular		Sanctuary
27. 286	'daughter, wife'			rectangular(?) moulding above		Sanctuary
28. 209	'dedicated'			cylindrical		Sanctuary
UNDATED						
29. 242	Poseidonios, son of Dionysios	Demos		white marble, moulding on top, very low		Sanctuary(?) (1870)
30. 259	Demetrios	Demetrios, the Athenian 'by decree'		rectangular(?)		Sanctuary(?) (1870)
31. 262	daughter of Pollis	Her father Pollis and husband — ' <i>arete, eunoia</i> '		rectangular, no moulding	'bronze statue' ( <i>IvPr</i> )	'Treasury' N. side of Sanctuary
32. 263	Nika . . .	' <i>arete, eunoia</i> '		'blue marble'		Sanctuary(?) (1870)



*Inschriften von Priene*, and that of Megabyzos was found at some distance from the Temple. A number of bases with inscriptions from the Sanctuary were reused in the Byzantine period in the church below the theatre, but the possibility cannot be excluded that they had been dismantled before the Byzantine period. There is no assurance that statues of Megabyzos and Nikó were in the Sanctuary when the Temple was destroyed by fire (see p. 257 below), or, if they were, that they were still on their original bases. There is evidence that bases were reused at Priene,<sup>4</sup> and this was very probably true of statues as well (see pp. 264 ff. below and Catalogue, 87), either for other dedications or simply as building material. The base of Sotades (Table J, no. 10) was used in the foundation of the Propylon and a large base on the south side of the Sanctuary was partially covered by the stoa (see Chapter I). It is hard to believe, however, that so many bases of the pre-Imperial period would have survived, if some of them, at least, were not still in use as bases. There is further evidence from other sites that statues were maintained in their original form for centuries after the dedication.<sup>5</sup>

Only two foreigners are known from the inscriptions to have been commemorated with statues in the Sanctuary in the 300 years of its existence as a shrine of Athena alone. The first was the Ephesian *neokoros* Megabyzos, the second, a Roman. A bronze image of Manius Aemilius Lepidus was erected on a square base in the period 84 to 78 B.C., according to Tuchelt (48 to 42 B.C. according to Blanck).<sup>6</sup> Just as that of Megabyzos was among the first dedications after Alexander's, so this, to a Roman *proquaestor*, was among the last before the rededication of the Sanctuary to Augustus. Tuchelt's observation that Roman officials were generally not honoured in Asia Minor before the first century B.C. (in contrast to the situation in Greece itself, for example at Delphi) is borne out here. He further observes that such honours in major sanctuaries, such as Artemis at Ephesus, come in the last decades of the Republic. In this respect the Lepidus dedication would be slightly unusual, but it is also noteworthy for another reason. The inscription honouring Lepidus is the second on the base, but there is only one set of 'footprints' for a bronze statue on the top of the block. There is no indication that a new statue was substituted; instead, the old bronze statue was simply rebaptised. This, together with evidence of the substitution of a head on the marble statue, 87, suggests that the practices described by Dio Chrysostom in a well-known speech (Book 31 — the *locus classicus* for statue reuse) were employed, on a modest scale at Priene, in the first century B.C.

#### *Imperial dedications*

In his study of Roman Imperial art in Asia Minor, Vermeule<sup>7</sup> suggests various possible motives for Augustus' choice of specific centres to rebuild or 'refund' and embellish with monuments of sculpture and architecture, as follows. Firstly, sites of victories like Philippi and Nicopolis (Actium) where, as at Clazomenae, he was known as *ktistes*;<sup>8</sup> secondly, refounded commercial and military centres (for example, Corinth, Patras); thirdly, cultural centres (Athens); and fourthly, Hellenistic religious centres and commercial crossroads (Ephesus). A fifth category could be added: sites of particular historical importance with special reference to the Julian *gens*; and perhaps a sixth — sites of extraordinary natural beauty. Augustus rebuilt the Temple at Ilium (Troy) and rededicated it with an inscription in bronze inlaid letters across the architrave, which read: [Αὐτοκράτωρ Καίσαρ θε]οῦ

Ἰουλίου? υἱὸς Σεβαστοῦ—], according to Frisch, which probably replaced an earlier by Augustus 'to Athena Ilias'.<sup>9</sup> The Temple contained portraits of Augustus and his family, some of which have survived.<sup>10</sup> Both Ilium and Augustus (as Caesar before)<sup>11</sup> traded on the belief, widely held at this time,<sup>12</sup> of Caesar's Trojan ancestry, and divine descent from Aphrodite.

Priene was not a commercial, military or cultural centre, nor was the Sanctuary of importance comparable to that of the Temple of Artemis at Ephesus. Caesar's father had been on good terms with the local Prienian aristocracy,<sup>13</sup> and the family of Augustus' librarian (see p. 256 below) may have held property in the area,<sup>14</sup> but Priene had nothing approaching the historical significance of the site of the Trojan War, for the Julii. Yet this was an historical place, and the site of the Temple, before the erection of the stoa (see Chapter I), commanded a breathtaking view, over the valley of the Maeander towards Miletus and Herakleia. Some attention would have been called to Priene when Antony (Plutarch, *Ant.*, 57) gave it to the guild of Dionysiac artists.

The fame of the Temple's builder was recalled by Vitruvius in his first book, *de Architectura* (Chapter I), which was dedicated by the author to Emperor Caesar about 29 B.C.<sup>15</sup> Although no mention is made in surviving literature of Alexander's dedication of the Temple, Augustus would sooner or later have learned of it (perhaps from Agrippa or his librarian, Macer, see below). The very idea of the architrave dedications, first at Troy, then here, implies an awareness of precedents which were in fact those established by the Hecatomnids and Alexander in this part of the world.

Alexander, it was noted earlier (Chapter I), sacrificed to Athena at Ilium and completed her Temple at Priene. Augustus rebuilt her Temple at Ilium and received sacrifices, together with Athena, at Priene. The inscription over the architrave here (*IvPr*, no. 157) reads 'Ο δῆμος Ἀθηναί[Π]ολιάδι καὶ [Αυτ]οκράτορι Καίσαρι θεοῦ υἱῷ θεῷ Σεβαστω[ι] καθιέρωσεν — 'The Demos dedicate [the Temple] to Athena Polias and divine Emperor Caesar Augustus the son of god [Divus Julius]'. Here the dedication is ostensibly to Augustus and not by him; the nominative of the Troy inscription parallels that of Alexander at Priene.

Alexander's career had clearly inspired Pompey, but it is difficult to say at this distance how important his example was to Caesar and to Augustus. The evidence which survives is in part a matter of chance, and the literary evidence is limited to what attracted an observer's fancy. For example, the statue of Caesar in his Forum was really a statue of Alexander (and Bucephalus) with Caesar's head; Augustus chose a painting of Alexander by Apelles for the Forum Augustum, and Claudius later substituted a head of Augustus for that of the first 'invincible god'.<sup>16</sup> This is information which appealed to the literary and artistic imagination. Two inscriptions on a provincial temple apparently did not, but they are at least as significant: one is the dedication of the Temple to Athena by the divinely inspired conqueror, the other is among the earliest dedications (in all probability) to the divine Augustus, and not merely to the *Genius Augusti*. Can it be pure coincidence that his *synnaos theos*, in this instance, is not the usual Dea Roma, but the very same Athena Polias honoured by Alexander?

That the rededication of an existing Temple was more than just an economy is indicated by the fact that there was a priest of Rome and Augustus (Table J, no. 21), and presumably a separate cult at Priene. Schede has suggested that the cult place was in the north stoa of